

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/826,676	04/05/2001	Jin-Wen Tzeng	P-1026	3516	
75	90 08/14/2003				
James R. Cartiglia			EXAMINER		
Graftech Inc. BRANDYWIN			OWENS, DOUGLAS W		
WILMINGTON	D PIKE, SUITE 301 N, DE 19803		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•			2811	2811 DATE MAILED: 08/14/2003	
			DATE MAILED: 08/14/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			Ym.
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	•
Advisory Action	09/826,676	TZENG ET AL.	
•	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Douglas W Owens	2811	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 21 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Apexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	o avoid abandonment of this appli : (1) a timely filed amendment wh peal (with appeal fee); or (3) a tim	ication. A proper re iich places the appli	ply to a cation in
PERIOD FOR	REPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) $\square$ The period for reply expires $3$ months from the mailing dat	e of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this a event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire late ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY W. 706.07(f).	r than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of AS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION.	See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shorte (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	tension and the corresponding amount of the ned statutory period for reply originally set in	ne fee. The appropriate ex in the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appella 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 G			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	d because:		
(a) 🔲 they raise new issues that would require fu	rther consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see No	te below);		
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application</li><li>issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	on in better form for appeal by ma	iterially reducing or	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without can	celing a corresponding number of	f finally rejected clai	ms.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following re	·		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wo canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	uld be allowable if submitted in a	separate, timely file	ed amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request application in condition for allowance because:		nsidered but does N	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	because it is not directed SOLEL	Y to issues which we	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims			l and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	ws:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-23</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on	_ is a) □ approved or b) □ disa <sub>l</sub>	pproved by the Exai	minėr.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure State	ment(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·	
10. Other:	1 2000	(Nomes	
<del></del>	TOM THON	<i>M</i> AS	
	SUPERVISORY PATEN TECHNOLOGY CEI	NT EXAMINER	



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments are not convincing. The Applicant argues that the cited references are only drawn to adhesive coating as opposed to the protective coating of the claimed invention. This argument is not convincing since Ingraham et al. teaches a protective coating that is identical to the material claimed in the instant application. Additinally, Shane et al. teaches that protective coatings may be applied to the GRAFOIL, in addition to the adhesive coatings (See Col. 14, lines 31 - 35, for example). Coatings applied for the purpose of adding reflectivity, additional strength and particularly wear and oxidation resitance are indeed protective coatings that would have been sufficient to prevent flaking.